

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040073US1

PATENT

Section II: REMARKS

It is respectfully requested that the changes as noted above in Section I be made to the present application.

In the above referenced Office Action, which was mailed on 2/18/2005, claims 9 and 10 were objected to as being duplicated claims. Claim 9 has herein been amended and is now dependent from claim 7 while claim 10 continues to be dependent from claim 1. As herein amended, claims 9 and 10 are believed to be allowable.

Next, claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as containing a reference to a universal serial bus which was alleged to be indefinite since standards are subject to change. Claim 6 has herein been cancelled without prejudice with the belief that the substance of claim 6 is protected in a broader context in the remaining claims.

Next, claims 13, 18-19 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Comer (US Patent 6,471,542, hereinafter referred to as "Comer"), claims 1-7, 11-12 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Harris (Publication US 2004/0217027, hereinafter referred to as "Harris"), claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Dickison (US Patent 5,839,394, hereinafter referred to as "Dickison") and claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Harris and in further view of Dickison. The above noted rejections are respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of the present application, and without waiving any of applicant's rights to argue the allowability of the originally presented claims in a subsequent appeal or other proceeding in the event that the Examiner does not concur that the present amendment places the

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040073US1

PATENT

application in condition for allowance, applicant has herein amended and clarified the claims to place them in condition for allowance over the cited references.

It is noted that, with the cancellation of claim 6 as stated above, the present application now includes claims 1-5 and 7-22, with claims 1, 13 and 19 being independent claims, and claims 2-5 and 7-12 being ultimately dependent from claim 1, claims 14-18 being ultimately dependent from claim 13 and claim 20-22 being ultimately dependent from claim 19.

All of the independent claims 1, 13 and 19, and therefore through dependence, all of the remaining claims as well, have herein been amended to clarify that, in accordance with the present invention, an **accessory cable** for an electronic device is provided which both provides **bottom support** for the electronic device and also provides a handle or **hand-grip** by which a user may hand-carry the electronic device.

Comer discloses an adapter carrying shoulder strap which may be attached (108a and 108b) to the **top portion** of a laptop computer. Since there is no bottom support for the laptop in Comer, the laptop is subject to being dropped if sufficient force is applied to the top of the computer while it is being carried or if the shoulder strap gets "caught" on another object while carrying the laptop. In the Comer reference, the attachment points must be at the top portion of the laptop because attachment to the bottom portion of the laptop would be unstable when used with the shoulder strap and the laptop would flip over at any time and be subject to sustaining damage. Thus, the shoulder strap and top attachment of Comer is incompatible with and teaches away from the bottom support and hand-grip taught by the applicant. Further, the bottom support as disclosed by the

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040073US1

PATENT

applicant provides a much more secure carrying system with much less risk of slippage or dropping. With the Comer shoulder strap, there is (and cannot be) any bottom support for the laptop as it is carried. Further, the shoulder strap of Comer does not form a "hand-grip" by which a laptop computer may be carried by one hand as disclosed and claimed by the applicant. Thus, as herein amended, applicant's claims include at least three features, inter alia, that are not, in combination, disclosed or even suggested by Comer, or any other of the references, i.e. the combination of using an **accessory cable** for an electronic device in order to provide **bottom support** for the device as well as a **hand-grip** by which the device may be hand-carried. Therefore, with respect to the rejection of claims 13, 18, 19, 21 and 22 as being anticipated by Comer, it is submitted that, as herein amended, since Comer lacks the combination elements as set forth above, claims 13, 18, 19, 21 and 22 are believed to be allowable under 35 USC 102(b) over Comer.

Next, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 20 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Harris, it is noted that the Harris reference discloses a harness but does not disclose, teach or even suggest the use of an **accessory cable** to provide bottom support for the laptop and a hand-grip for the user. Even using the bare-bones harness of Harris, the problems solved by the present invention remain, i.e. with Harris a user would still have to carry the power cable separately. Further, Harris does not even recognize the accessory problem much less propose a solution. Still further, there is no suggestion in either Harris or Comer for the proposed combination of references and even if there were, such a combination is incompatible and taught away from by both references since Harris requires a hand-carry grip while Comer requires a shoulder strap and neither scheme will work with the other. Thus, as herein

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040073US1

PATENT

amended, with claim 6 being cancelled for other reasons, it is believed that claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12 and 20 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Harris.

Next, with respect to the rejection of claims 14-17 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Dickison, it is noted that Dickison is cited merely to show a Velcro attachment used on a dog leash. Claims 14-17 ultimately depend from claim 13, which, as herein amended, includes the combination of a cable accessory for an electron device being used in providing bottom support for the electronic device as well as a carrying handle by which the electronic device may be carried. Dickison, like Comer and like Harris, fails to teach, disclose or even suggest, inter alia, the three feature combination of elements as described above and there is no suggestion in any of the references for the proposed combination or the interfacing of a shoulder strap, a harness and a dog leash, which appear to have entirely different and incompatible functions and purposes, none of which has anything to do with the accessory-carrying problem solved by the applicant. Therefore, as herein amended, it is believed that claims 14-17 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Dickison.

With regard to the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Harris and in further view of Dickison, it is noted that claims 8-10 ultimately depend from and include all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Thus, since the combination of Comer even in view of Harris and still further in view of Dickison, fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed combination as discussed in the above paragraph, it is believed that claims 8-10 are also allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Comer in view of Harris and even in further view of Dickison.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 03 2005

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040073US1

PATENT

New picture claim 23 has been added by this amendment and includes all of the above-noted distinguishing features of the present invention. Accordingly, new claim 23 is also believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-5 and 7-23, as herein presented, are believed to be in condition for allowance, an early notice of which is hereby requested. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting the allowance of this application, and especially if one or more new references are cited, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below, prior to the issuance of another Office Action, in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to further amend the claims by Supplemental Amendment or Examiner's Amendment, as may be appropriate, to place the claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner's attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert V. Wilder

Robert V. Wilder (Tel: 512-246-8555)
Registration No. 26,352
Attorney for Applicants
4235 Kingsburg Drive
Round Rock, Texas 78681